



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The Black Jews of Malabar are mentioned by most of the medieval travelers. Interesting references are found, particularly in Marco Polo.

The expression "ten thousand" need not be taken too exactly; such expressions are frequently used in the Hebrew scriptures as "round numbers." But as a mere question in anthropology, assuming a migration 1850 years ago, not maintained by fresh accessions, there would be nothing unreasonable in the gradual absorption or reduction of the colony, from an original 10,000 to a present 1500.

WILFRED H. SCHOFF.

PHILADELPHIA.

#### A NEW ERA IN THE HISTORY OF THE "APOCRYPHA."

During the years 1825-1827 the British and Foreign Bible Society was engaged in a controversy which threatened to put an end to its existence. The bone of contention was the group of fifteen extra-canonical books (or appendixes) belonging to the Old Testament, known in England since the latter part of the sixteenth century as the "Apocrypha." A majority of the directors wished to exclude these books from publication and distribution by the society; the opposing minority clung to the former policy of permitting their circulation in those countries where the branch societies wished to retain them. The whole controversy, it should be borne in mind, concerned only the copies of the scriptures distributed on the continent. In England the apocryphal books, though expressly designated as profane and apparently little read, were still printed in standard editions of the Bible, besides being used to some extent in the church lectionary. As early as 1813 energetic attempts had been made to adopt for the Bible Society a policy definitely opposed to the publication of these "uninspired writings"; but the resulting outcry on the continent, especially in Germany, Austria and Sweden, had restrained the directors from taking the proposed action. At length, in 1825, the Edinburgh branch society sent its ultimatum to London: Either the British and Foreign Bible Society must cease, entirely and finally, from distributing the Apocrypha, or else the Scottish societies must withdraw their support. Apart from other unfortunate consequences of such a secession, the fact that the contribution of the Scotch auxiliaries to the funds of the society had averaged considerably over five thousand pounds a year made the Edinburgh note a very formidable document. The society could

not dispense with the support of Scotland; but, on the other hand, how could it afford to take a step which would probably result in lopping off the important continental branches? So the controversy waxed hot, and continued unabated until 1827, when the adherents of the stricter praxis won the day, and the society formally adopted a rule against the circulation of the troublesome group of writings. This action had two chief consequences. In the first place, the most of the branch societies on the continent severed their connection with the parent organization, and thenceforward went their own way. In the second place, the Scotchmen, whose blood was up, now demanded the immediate removal of all those officers of the Bible Society who had stood on the side of the Apocrypha. This demand being refused, they also announced their secession, and an independent Bible Society in Edinburgh was forthwith founded.

The story of this controversy illustrates very well the characteristic attitude in Great Britain toward the extra-canonical books of the Old Testament during the whole history of the English Bible. It is true, of course, that the European churches all through the middle ages had recognized a difference in value and authority between the "canonical" and the "uncanonical" scriptures, and that Luther and his German Bible had added new emphasis to this view. But the Protestant churches on the continent never carried the distinction so far as it was carried in Great Britain, and the "apocryphal" writings which happened to be within reach continued to be more familiar there than in England. The decree of the Council of Trent (1545-1563) which pronounced the most of these writings canonical and authoritative also made much less impression in England than in Protestant Europe.

The Wycliffe Bible (1382) contained only those books of the Old Testament which were included in the Hebrew canon. The translation was made from the Latin (of course), and the preface accompanying it contained a paraphrase of the words of Jerome to the effect that whatever Old Testament writings stood outside this canon were "without authority of belief." Coverdale's Bible (1535) was the first in English to contain the extra-canonical books. Those which he included in the group were the same which have continued to be printed in the successive editions of the English Bible down to the present day. The list was an arbitrary and in some sense accidental one, since it included only those books which were commonly found in Vulgate Latin manuscripts. In the codices themselves, whether Latin or Greek, they were of course scattered

about in the places where they seemed to belong, logically or chronologically; it was an innovation to put them by themselves. The first to do this was the German scholar Carlstadt (Wittenberg, 1520). Coverdale printed them in a group at the end of the Old Testament, and styled them "The Apocrypha." Martin Luther, only one year before, had done the same thing, though his list was different from that of Coverdale. In the Articles of the Church of England, as revised in 1553, Article VI (formerly V) took its stand squarely on the sole authority of the Hebrew canon, using generally the long-familiar words of Jerome. There was added a list of the Old Testament books of inferior value, but this named only Third and Fourth Esdras, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach and Second Maccabees. In the revision of 1571, however, the list was increased to include all the books, or parts of books, now included in the Apocrypha of the English Bible. In the Geneva Bible (1560) an innovation was made, in that the translation of the writings of this group was made directly from the Greek instead of from the Latin. In the King James Bible of 1611 we are able for the first time to control the version which lies before us, for we know that it was made chiefly from the Greek of the Complutensian Polyglot. Furthermore, this version of 1611 was not greatly altered in the revision of 1894. The English scholars in charge of the Revised Version of the Bible undertook to do for the Apocrypha what they had done for the Old and New Testaments, confining their efforts, of course, to that list of extra-canonical writings which had formed a part of English sacred scripture ever since Coverdale. The critical apparatus used by them was hardly adequate, and the work was not very thoroughly done; hence the revised English text of these books is perhaps even less satisfactory than that of the canonical scriptures.

In the English Bible, then, the "Apocrypha" has had a remarkably uniform history. The group has been made up of the same writings from the first and has always occupied the same place at the end of the Old Testament. Hardly less uniform has been the neglect of the group, as a whole, by English students of the Bible. It is true that selections from a number of apocryphal books were included in the Book of Common Prayer, so that in this way portions of the uncanonical group became widely familiar; the selections were repeatedly reduced in number, however, beginning in 1604, and their reading restricted to week-day services, until the public use of this semi-sacred scripture was brought down

to almost nothing. As a matter of course, in a land where great stress was laid on the authority of the Bible, and where at the same time the apocryphal books were expressly declared to be uninspired and without authority, opposition to any use of these writings which seemed to put them on a par with holy writ was bound to be strong and to increase, both in the Church of England and among the non-conformists. The Puritans objected strenuously to the practice of reading the Apocrypha in church. The Westminster Confession (1647) says of the books that they "are of no authority in the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of than other human writings." In a sermon on the unity of scripture, preached in 1643 before the House of Commons by the celebrated scholar Lightfoot, the preacher expressed his disgust at the admission of this inferior matter to a place inside the sacred book: "Thus sweetly and nearly should the two Testaments join together, and thus divinely would kiss each other, but that the wretched Apocrypha doth thrust in between." Between this point of view and that of the Austrian pastor who declared, about 1850, that he would not suffer a Bible without the Apocrypha to remain under his roof<sup>1</sup> there is a wide difference, though hardly as wide as the language used would indicate. But what is of especial importance to the history of Biblical science is this, that in England, more than on the continent, the study of the Apocrypha was, and continued to be, neglected by scholars. Even in this present generation, in the light which historical study has brought, the traditional neglect of the Apocrypha, as uninspired and therefore unimportant, has persisted. Such a comprehensive and thorough work as Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, for example, leaves out of consideration this uncanonical Jewish material, most of it contemporaneous and none of it negligible. The lack of a satisfactory English translation has already been mentioned; and to this must be added, that until the present year no commentary on the Apocrypha as a whole, or on any considerable part of the collection, has appeared in English since 1888 (*The Speaker's Commentary*, edited by Henry Wace).

Under these circumstances, the appearance of a comprehensive work by representative English scholars, containing a new and thorough treatment of the Apocrypha, and of all the available extra-canonical Jewish scripture belonging to the same period, is an event of very considerable importance. Such a work has now

<sup>1</sup> W. Canton, *History of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, II, p. 224.

been issued by the Oxford University Press<sup>2</sup> in two bulky volumes prepared under the editorial supervision of Dr. R. H. Charles, well known all over the world as an expert in this field of investigation. The names of most of the twenty-seven other collaborators are already familiar in this country, and the remainder will be familiar from this time on. The size of the two volumes will give some idea of the magnitude of the undertaking, for they are in folio and together contain more than fifteen hundred pages. It is the most complete and valuable collection of this "apocryphal" literature that has ever been made. The nearest approach to it is the similar collection published in 1900 by German scholars under the editorial supervision of the late Professor Kautzsch. The German work, very similar in plan to the English, was also issued in two volumes entitled respectively "Apocrypha" and "Pseudepigrapha." This division, it must be admitted, is not an altogether satisfactory one. Several of the Apocrypha are pseudepigrapha of the most characteristic type; the majority of the so-called Pseudepigrapha are not really such, and some of them have the historic right to be included in the "Apocrypha"—so far as this term can be said to have any definite meaning. It would perhaps have been well to take this opportunity to introduce a new and better terminology. It might, indeed, have seemed desirable to retain the time-honored name so long applied to a portion of the Biblical books. But the term "Apocrypha" has had many meanings, and the group of writings designated by it has been a widely varying quantity. So far as the English Bible is concerned, the fact is at once very noticeable that Volume I of this great Oxford *corpus* breaks through the traditional bounds of the group, changing what had stood unchanged for nearly four hundred years; a new member, 3 Maccabees, is added to the group, while 4 Ezra ("Second Esdras") which had always been a member of it, is transferred to Volume II. We have, in fact, good reason now to say *exit Apocrypha*, with reference to the old English nomenclature; since it is not easy to see why any new edition should ever be issued of the particular fifteen documents which have stood together from the time of Coverdale to that of the Revised Version.

As for the designation Pseudepigrapha, it is undesirable for this large and important collection of writings; first, because it

<sup>2</sup> *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* in English with introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books, edited in conjunction with many scholars, by R. H. Charles, D. Litt., D.D. Vol. I, Apocrypha; Vol. II, Pseudepigrapha. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913.

does not apply at all to the major part of them, and secondly, because even in the case of the remainder it emphasizes unduly—and with a somewhat unpleasant sound—a characteristic which is really of minor importance. It would seem better to make “Apocrypha” cover both volumes, or else to use for both some such title as “Uncanonical Jewish Scriptures.”

The collection is intended to include “all the extant non-canonical Jewish books written between 200 B. C. and 100 A. D. with possibly one or two exceptions” (so in the Introduction to Vol. II). It would have been better to say, all of the literature of this class *whose authorship is unknown*, since the two great Jewish writers of the period, Philo and Josephus, are not included. Even with this restriction, the collection contains both less and more than is promised. There are numerous other available monuments of the literature, of the very same kind as these “pseudepigrapha” and perhaps equally deserving to be brought into this *corpus*, which receive no mention here; while on the other hand, the limits 200 B. C. and 100 A. D. are both exceeded by writings in the collection. The student of the Bible, or of ancient literature, who is familiar with the Old Testament Apocrypha, but has not kept track of recent investigations in the allied literature is sure to be much surprised and interested when he looks into the second volume of Dr. Charles’s work. He will see not only important progress made in the interpretation of ancient writings already long known, such as the Books of Adam and Eve, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, and the Martyrdom of Isaiah, but also a number of titles which until recently were quite unknown, such as the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, the Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, the Story of Ahikar in its oldest form (an Aramaic papyrus of the fifth century B. C., first published in 1911), and the important Fragments of a Zadokite Work, first published in 1910.

The general editor of the work, Dr. Charles, edits no less than seven of the books which it contains, besides contributing more or less to the treatment of several others. This, however, is but a part of his real share in the undertaking. No scholar has done more than he for the study of this literature, not only in his own valuable editions of text and translations—a long list—and in his many special investigations, but also in the extent to which he has succeeded in stirring up other scholars to work with him in his chosen field. It is to him, unquestionably, that we are mainly indebted for the plan and execution of this great task. It is true that

his labors as general editor were taken rather lightly by him; the general Introductions to the volumes are hastily written, ill-proportioned, and altogether inadequate; but this is a defect which must be pronounced very small in proportion to what he has achieved. The work of all the contributors is on a high plane of excellence and a credit to English scholarship. There is more unevenness than is desirable in the manner of treatment of the various books: the introductions to Sirach and Tobit are too long, and the annotations in part (the difficult critical apparatus) out of place; Judith has no bibliography; the notes to 2 Maccabees are disproportionately meager. It is unfortunate, too, that the reader should not have been given some definite information as to the nature and origin of the translations which are here placed before him. He is left to find out for himself as best he can whether the English text given is that of the Revised Version, as in 1 Esdras, Judith, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, and one of the two columns in Susanna and Bel and the Dragon; or the Revised Version slightly modified, as in the Wisdom of Solomon; or a new and independent translation, as in most of the remaining books.

But the fact can hardly be too strongly emphasized that the publication of this great body of uncanonical Jewish scriptures, never before brought together in such completeness, marks an epoch. The writings themselves, and the period of history to which they belong, will receive from this time on such attention as they have not received before. The study of both Old Testament and New Testament is now entering a new phase, and the next few decades will certainly see a considerable advance in important respects. Several causes have contributed to make possible a closer examination and a truer appreciation of the history out of which the New Testament grew; and, at the same time, of the background of the latest books of the Old Testament. It seems as though we were at last really approaching a just judgment of the religious impulses which brought into being these great monuments, to say nothing of the dawning consciousness that what we had supposed to be commonplace pamphlets are really products of great literary skill. The Jews had a genius for religion, as has often been said and as Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism bear eloquent witness, but their representative writers also had a fine artistic sense and literary taste. In these uncanonical scriptures we have a body of little-used material from the very time when the Jews had outgrown many of the old forms of thought and belief and with



the light received from the outside world were trying new modes of expression. We find here all the most characteristic forms of Hebrew literature: edifying narrative of widely differing types constructed with consummate skill, as in *Judith*, *Tobit*, and *1 Maccabees*; the proverbial philosophy of Palestine (*Bar Sira*), and some of the more universal literature of this class (*Ahikar*) which was at least read and studied in the Holy Land; a Jewish-Greek philosophical discourse (*4 Maccabees*); a magnificent specimen of Alexandrine theology (*Book of Wisdom*); a belated bit of old Hebrew "prophecy" of the purest type (latter part of *Baruch*); very clear and definite expressions of the Messianic hope, in poetry of lofty style (*Psalms of Solomon*); several specimens of that characteristic product of the Semitic imagination called the "apocalypse," such as the *Enoch books*, *2 Esdras*, and others less remarkable; a fine bit of Palestinian "wisdom" composed with a purely literary aim, and without any religious motive (the *Story of the Three Youths*, in *1 Esdras*); and others equally worthy of special mention. One extremely useful service which the great Oxford publication will render is this, that it will show our English and American scholars how very much remains to be done in the investigation of this mass of intra-canonical literature even in the most familiar and best preserved members of the group.

The history of the Apocrypha in the United States has been much the same as in England. The causes which operated in the mother country to open a wide gulf between "canonical" and "apocryphal" scriptures operated in this land also from the first. The American Bible Society, which was founded in 1816 under the influence of its predecessor in London, followed the Apocrypha controversy with keen interest, and was confirmed in its own policy by the result. The Bibles which it issued never contained the objectionable books, and the latter were more and more rarely seen, whether in American or in English editions. So it was not only natural, but a matter of course, that the Biblical scholars of this country in building up their department of science should have confined their attention to those scriptures which recognized authority had declared to be alone of divine origin.

The time for including the apocryphal books in the Bible has doubtless gone by. It was for more than one good reason, indeed, that they were excluded from the sacred canon by the Jews and those who followed their example. It was not merely that the books were known to be of late date; taken as a whole, they stand on a de-

cidedly lower plane than their canonical fellows, viewed from either the religious or the literary standpoint. It was because of their own character, and not through any accident, that they were left at one side. But on the other hand, it is important to bear in mind that it was not the result of mere chance that these particular books were preserved. It was the popular demand, first in the Jewish community and then in the Christian church, that selected them and kept them from perishing. They were not only characteristic products of their own time, but those writings—out of a vast number—which had proved themselves capable of wielding influence far beyond that time. We have, then, good ground for feeling that in studying these books which occupy the lower shelf of sacred scripture we are getting in touch with the common people, the humbler laymen of the two ancient religious communities in which they circulated; since it is to such an extent true that they represent the popular stratum of the religious literature to which they belong, containing not the more abstruse thought, and the outbursts of unusual emotion, produced by men who were unlike their fellows, but rather the feelings and beliefs which were cherished by the multitude. For this reason also, then, seeing that modern historical science tends more and more to find its center of gravity in the life of the common people, it seems certain that these half-forgotten records are destined now to be studied with new interest, not merely by experts in Biblical science and the history of religions, but by all those who have found their way to a truly wide study of literature and life.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

### THE SABIANS.

One of the most important forerunners of Christianity is a sect whose adherents are called in the New Testament the disciples of John, or simply Disciples. They are Jewish separatists closely connected with the Sabians, and according to Neander positively identical with them. They kept the Mosaic law, but had adopted Babylonian and Persian beliefs. In fact we may regard them as a Judaized branch of the Mandæans.

The Mandæans are still found in scanty numbers in the Orient, mainly in Persia and southern Babylonia, but they are gradually disappearing. They are pre-Christian, however, in their origin and